



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/087,158	03/01/2002	Jeffrey A. Stocker	10022/234	2612
28164	7590	06/02/2005	EXAMINER	
ACCENTURE CHICAGO 28164 BRINKS HOFFER GILSON & LIONE P O BOX 10395 CHICAGO, IL 60610			VAUGHN, GREGORY J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2178	

DATE MAILED: 06/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/087,158	<b>Applicant(s)</b> STOCKER ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Gregory J. Vaughn	<b>Art Unit</b> 2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 March 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

20

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Application History*

1. This action is responsive to the application amendment, filed on 3/17/2005.
2. Applicant has amended claims 4, 14, 18 and 24.
3. Claims 1-26 are pending in the case, claims 1 and 14 are independent claims.
4. Applicant has amended the specification in response to the objections cited by the examiner in the *Drawings* and *Specification* sections of the previous office action (dated 12/13/2004). Applicant's amendment has addressed the objections previously made, and therefore, in view of the amendment, objections to the drawings and specification are withdrawn.
5. Examiner's rejection of claim 24, made under 35 USC 112 in the *Claim Rejections – 35 USC 112* section of the previous office action (dated 12/13/2004) is withdrawn in view of the amended claim.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

*"A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –*

*(b) The invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States."*

7. Claims 1-3, 5-8, 14 and 19-22 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Pinard et al. US Patent 5,940,834, filed 3/13/1997, patented 8/17/1999 (hereinafter Pinard).

8. **Regarding independent claim 1**, Pinard discloses a personal web page generator. Pinard recites: *"The web page generator of the present invention provides automatic web page creation of an organizational directory"* (column 1, lines 52-53). Pinard discloses an application server in Figure 1 at reference sign 120. Pinard discloses the management of content. Pinard recites: *"The directory application in the preferred embodiment may be written in any appropriate computer language that provides for data entry and control, and storage of information"* (column 4, lines 12-16). Pinard discloses the use of a web page template. Pinard recites: *"creating and saving a member web page template and parent web page template each containing fields for storing specific information"* (column 2, lines 4-6).

Pinard discloses a database of personal data. Pinard recites: *"inputting member information into a directory database for each of a plurality of members"* (column 2, lines 7-8). Pinard discloses a database for members of a sales force in Figure 4A at reference sign 325 (shown as *"Sales Manager"*). Pinard discloses in Figure 1, the database (shown at reference sign 125) in communication with the application server (shown at reference sign 120).

Pinard discloses the population of the template with the data from the database. Pinard recites: *"for each of the plurality of members replacing the fields in the member web page template with the member information and saving the member web page template with the fields replaced with the member information as a member specific web page"* (column 2, lines 11-15). Pinard discloses the web page accessible through a publicly distributed network. Pinard recites: *"Directory web pages generated by the present invention are stored in computer memory 130 of web server 110 and are made accessible to local user 160 and/or remote user 170 at the discretion of the administrator of the web server 110"* (column 3, lines 55-58).

9. **Regarding dependent claim 2**, Pinard discloses in Figure 1 the use of a production server (shown at reference sign 110 as *"Web Server"*) in communication (the connection shown at reference sign 140) with the application server (shown at reference sign 120). Pinard disclose the production server generating and storing web pages. Pinard recites: *"FIG. 1, web server 110 is connected to local area network 140. Web server 110 is a standard Internet or Intranet computing machine, as is well known in the art,*

*that is capable of displaying web pages of Hypertext Markup Language (HTML) format. HTML is a markup system used to create Hypertext documents"* (column 3, lines 33-38).

10. **Regarding dependent claim 3**, Pinard discloses the use of an additional server in Figure 1 at reference sign 180 (Shown as PBX). Pinard discloses the use of the PBX to generate web pages. Pinard recites: *"PBX 180 from a local user 160 or remote user 170 may be provided for enhanced telephony notification and control via the web pages generated by the method of the present invention. This allows for additional functionality and features such that a sophisticated organizational web page directory may be generated by the method of the present invention"* (column 9, lines 34-40).
11. **Regarding dependent claim 5**, Pinard discloses biographical information as personal data in Figure 4A at reference sign 320 (shown as *"Title"*).
12. **Regarding dependent claim 6**, Pinard discloses photos as personal data. Pinard recites: *"the directory application can be programmed to prompt the administrator to include a picture"* (column 4, lines 66-67).
13. **Regarding dependent claim 7**, Pinard discloses in Figure 8 at reference signs 715 and 798 a plurality of members.
14. **Regarding dependent claim 8**, Pinard discloses in Figure 4A at reference signs 330, 340 and 350 point of contact information.

Art Unit: 2178

15. **Regarding independent claim 14**, the claim is directed toward a method for the system of claim 1, and remains rejected using the same rationale.
16. **Regarding dependent claim 19**, the claim is directed toward a method for the system of claim 7, and remains rejected using the same rationale.
17. **Regarding dependent claim 20**, the claim is directed toward a method for the system of claim 5, and remains rejected using the same rationale.
18. **Regarding dependent claim 21**, the claim is directed toward a method for the system of claim 6, and remains rejected using the same rationale.
19. **Regarding dependent claim 22**, Pinard discloses in Figure 4A at reference signs 325 manager information (shown as "*Sales Manger*").

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

20. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

*"(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made."*

21. Claims 4 and 18 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pinard in view of Graham et al. US Publication 2004/0205537, filed 10/19/2001, published 10/14/2004 (hereinafter Graham).

22. **Regarding dependent claim 4**, Pinard discloses a webpage generating system using a template from an application server combined with data from a personal database as described above. Pinard fails to disclose a personal database that tracks the employment status of the member and using the status to affect the functionality of the system. Graham teaches the capture and use of the member employment status. Graham recites: *"User management process 208 may be used to create, update, and access the information in the user records. As indicated above, this information may include personal information relating to the user, such as the user's name, address, date of birth, gender, social security number, etc., employment data relating to the user, such as the user's employment status (active, retired, fired, etc.)"* (page 3, paragraph 32).



Therefore, it would have been obvious, to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to capture and use the employment status of a member as taught by Graham with Pinard's personal web page system in order to "*control access to intellectual property, facilitate use and integration of the intellectual property*" (Graham, page1, paragraph 12).

23. **Regarding dependent claim 18**, the claim is directed toward a method for the system of claim 4, and remains rejected using the same rationale.

24. Claims 9-13, 15-17 and 23-26 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pinard in view of Kitain et al. US Patent 5,864,871, filed 1/28/1997, patented 1/26/1999 (hereinafter Kitain).

25. **Regarding dependent claim 9**, Pinard discloses a webpage generating system using a template from an application server combined with data from a personal database as described above. Pinard fails to disclose the information stored in the database as a business philosophy. Kitain discloses the storage and use of a business philosophy. Kitain recites: "*The actual contents (e.g., the corporate information) and the format of the actual contents as displayed in the contents frame is determined by the corporation itself. Thus, the "look and feel" of the actual contents may mirror the corporation's annual report and/or reflect the style, philosophy and vision of the corporation as seen by the corporation*" (column 8, lines 1-6).

Therefore, it would have been obvious, to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to use the business philosophy in the web

page as taught by Kitain with Pinard's personal web page system in order to *"provide the investors, portfolio managers and traders with additional information that would be useful in making investment decisions and recommendations"* (Kitain, column 4, lines 15-18).

26. **Regarding dependent claims 10 and 11**, Pinard discloses a webpage generating system using a template from an application server combined with data from a personal database as described above. Pinard fails to disclose the use of live information (claim 10), where the live information is news reports (claim 11). Kitain discloses the use of live information as news reports. Kitain recites: *"In the representative embodiment, the contributor workstations execute a program called Multex Contributor.TM, described in detail in the user manual titled "MX Contributor--User Guide" available from Multex Systems, Inc. of New York, N.Y. and expressly incorporated herein by reference. The Multex Contributor.TM. program is a real-time Windows-based document indexing and transfer program used to disseminate reports"* (column 11, lines 55-62).

Therefore, it would have been obvious, to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to use live information in the web page as taught by Kitain with Pinard's personal web page system in order to *"provide the investors, portfolio managers and traders with additional information that would be useful in making investment decisions and recommendations"* (Kitain, column 4, lines 15-18).

27. **Regarding dependent claim 12**, Pinard discloses a member webpage generating system using a template from an application server combined with data from a personal database as described above. Pinard fails to disclose the members as being members of a sales force of an investment broker. Kitain discloses an investment broker sales force. Kitain recites: *"As used herein, the terms "investor" and "user" include any end user who is permitted to receive or access information via the present invention, such as, for example, customers of brokerage and investment banking firms, employees of brokerage and investment banking firms, investment advisors, brokers, bankers, portfolio and fund managers, journalists, analysts, economists, university professors, MBA students, etc"* (column, 11, lines 35-42).

Therefore, it would have been obvious, to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to use financial consultant member information of a retail investment broker organization in the web page as taught by Kitain with Pinard's personal web page system in order to *"provide the investors, portfolio managers and traders with additional information that would be useful in making investment decisions and recommendations"* (Kitain, column 4, lines 15-18).

28. **Regarding dependent claim 13**, Pinard discloses a webpage generating system using a template from an application server combined with data from a personal database as described above. Pinard fails to disclose the web page containing information about products. Kitain discloses the use of information of products: *"a corporation wishes to provide information on a*

Art Unit: 2178

*controlled basis. For example, the corporation may want to provide information (e.g., detailed financial data or specialized product information)"* (column 4, lines 48-51).

Therefore, it would have been obvious, to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to use product information in the web page as taught by Kitain with Pinard's personal web page system in order to *"provide the investors, portfolio managers and traders with additional information that would be useful in making investment decisions and recommendations"* (Kitain, column 4, lines 15-18).

29. **Regarding dependent claim 15**, the claim is directed toward a method for the system of claim 12, and remains rejected using the same rationale.

30. **Regarding dependent claim 16**, Pinard discloses a webpage generating system using a template from an application server combined with data from a personal database as described above. Pinard fails to disclose the web page being approved prior to release. Kitain discloses the approval of prior to release. Kitain recites: *"The corporation will then review and approve the final editorialized corporate template"* (column 43, lines 34-35).

Therefore, it would have been obvious, to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to review and approve the web page as taught by Kitain with Pinard's personal web page system in order to *"provide the investors, portfolio managers and traders with additional information that*

Art Unit: 2178

*would be useful in making investment decisions and recommendations"*

(Kitain, column 4, lines 15-18).

31. **Regarding dependent claim 17**, Pinard discloses a webpage generating system using a template from an application server combined with data from a personal database as described above. Pinard fails to disclose updating the web page. Kitain discloses updating the web page. Kitain recites: "*According to this embodiment, corporate information is acquired, indexed and updated*" (column 42, lines 64-65).

Therefore, it would have been obvious, to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to update the web page as taught by Kitain with Pinard's personal web page system in order to "*provide the investors, portfolio managers and traders with additional information that would be useful in making investment decisions and recommendations*" (Kitain, column 4, lines 15-18).

32. **Regarding dependent claim 23**, the claim is directed toward a method for the system of claim 10, and remains rejected using the same rationale.

33. **Regarding dependent claim 24**, the claim is directed toward a method for the system of claim 9, and remains rejected using the same rationale.

34. **Regarding dependent claim 25**, Pinard discloses a webpage generating system using a template from an application server combined with data from a personal database as described above. Pinard fails to disclose the web

Art Unit: 2178

page containing information to enhance customer perception of the qualifications of the members of the sales force. Kitain discloses the use of information to enhance customer perception of the qualifications of the members of the sales force in Figure 8 at reference sign 872 (shown as "*Global Commitment ...*").

Therefore, it would have been obvious, to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to use information to enhance customer perception of the qualifications of the members of the sales force in the web page as taught by Kitain with Pinard's personal web page system in order to "*provide the investors, portfolio managers and traders with additional information that would be useful in making investment decisions and recommendations*" (Kitain, column 4, lines 15-18).

35. **Regarding dependent claim 26**, the claim is directed toward a method for the system of claim 11, and remains rejected using the same rationale.

***Response to Arguments***

36. Applicant's arguments filed 3/17/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

37. **Regarding independent claim 1**, the applicant recites: "*Claim 1 is directed to a system for generating personal homepages and comprises "an application server comprising a content manager server and a content delivery server."* Pinard fails to disclose this feature. Pinard discloses an "application server" 120, but fails to disclose that the application server comprises both a "content manager server and a content delivery server" (page 10, third paragraph of the amendment filed 3/17/2005). The applicant is directed to the rejection of claim 1, as restated above. In response to applicant's argument that the cited reference fails to disclose: "*an application server comprising a content management server and a content delivery server*", Pinard clearly discloses the application server in Figure 1 at reference sign 120. Pinard discloses the application server providing content management services in column 4 at lines 9-24 (described as "*directory application*" stored in the "*application server*"). Pinard discloses the application server providing content delivery services in column 4, lines 9-24 (described as "*Oracle may be used as the database*"). Oracle is well known in the art as a relational database management system (RDMS), which uses proprietary software to deliver content.

38. **Regarding dependent claim 2**, the applicant recites: "*Claim 2 incorporates the limitations of claim 1 and recites three servers: application server comprising a content manager server and a content deliver server, and a production server. Pinard fails to disclose this configuration with three servers, and discloses only two servers*" (page 10, fourth paragraph of the amendment filed 3/17/2005). The applicant is directed to the rejection of claim 2, as restated above. Pinard discloses the application server with content management and delivery services as described above. Pinard further discloses the production server in figure 1 at reference sign 110 (shown as "Web Server"). In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "*three servers*") are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).
39. **Regarding dependent claim 3**, the applicant recites: "*Claim 3 incorporates the limitations of claim 2 and recites four servers. As noted above, Pinard only discloses two servers*" (page 11, first paragraph of the amendment filed 3/17/2005). The applicant is directed to the rejection of claim 3, as restated above. Pinard discloses a service that generates web pages in Figure 1 at reference sign 180 (shown as "BPX"). In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "*four*



Art Unit: 2178

servers") are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

40. **Regarding dependent claim 7**, the applicant recites: "*Claim 7 and its dependent claim 8 relate to a homepage for a sales team comprising a plurality of members. A sales team is a subset of the members of a sales force. Pinard discloses only two levels of webpages: a page for a single employee (e.g. FIG. 4A), and a parent web page for the entire company directory (FIG. 8). Pinard fails to disclose a homepage for a sales team comprising a plurality of members of that sales team*" (page 11, second paragraph of the amendment filed 3/17/2005). The applicant is directed to the rejection of claim 7, as restated above. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "*homepage for a sales team*", "*a sales team is a subset of the members of a sales force*", and "*two levels of webpages*") are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

41. **Regarding dependent claim 8**, the applicant recites: "*Pinard also fails to disclose a homepage of a sales team including a plurality of the team*

*members and a point of contact*" (page 11, second paragraph of the amendment filed 3/17/2005). The applicant is directed to the rejection of claim 8, as restated above. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., *"homepage for a sales team including a plurality of team members"*) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

42. **Regarding dependent claim 14**, the applicant recites: *"As shown in FIGS. 2 and 3, existing data 20 from the database is sued to populate the homepage, whereas Pinard discloses inputting the data to be placed into the homepage. Thus, Pinard fails to disclose the method of claims 14"* (page 12, first paragraph of the amendment filed 3/17/2005). The applicant is directed to the rejection of claim 14, as restated above. In response to applicant's argument that the reference fails to disclose using data from the database to populate the webpage, Pinard discloses *"Replace template fields with info from the database"* in Figure 3 at reference sign 252.

43. **Regarding dependent claim 19**, the applicant recites: *"Pinard fails to disclose a homepage for a sales team comprising a plurality of members of that sales team. Instead, Pinard discloses a parent webpage listing a directory of names of all members of a company, not just those that are*

*members of a sales team, as recited*" (page 12, second paragraph of the amendment filed 3/17/2005). The applicant is directed to the rejection of claim 19, as restated above. Pinard discloses "*member of a sales force who work for a sales team*" in Figure 4a at reference sign 325 (shown as "Sales Manager"). In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "*homepage for a sales team*") are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

44. **Regarding dependent claim 4**, the applicant recites: "*Graham fails to make a specific teaching of that "employment status" is used to control access*" (page 13, first paragraph of the amendment filed 3/17/2005). The applicant is directed to the rejection of claim 4, as restated above. Graham discloses the use of "*data indicative of employment status*" and a "*component for recognizing data indicative of employment status*". Graham discloses a "*User management process 208*" that uses the "*user's employment status*" to "*access the information in the user records*" (page 3, paragraph 32).

45. In response to applicant's argument "*To further distinguish claim 14 from Graham*" (page 13, second paragraph of the amendment filed 3/17/2005). The applicant is directed to the rejection of claim 14, as restated above. Claim

Art Unit: 2178

14 of the present application was rejected under 35 USC 102(b) in view of Pinard. The Graham reference was not used in the rejection of claim 14.

46. **Regarding dependent claim 18**, the applicant recites: "*Nothing in Graham suggests that the access to the homepage being automatically controlled by the employment status*" (page 14, first paragraph of the amendment filed 3/17/2005). The applicant is directed to the rejection of claim 18, as restated above, and the response to arguments related to claim 4 above.

47. **Regarding dependent claims 10 and 11**, the applicant recites: "*Kitain fails to suggest a live information or news report being populated on the web page*" (page 14, third paragraph of the amendment filed 3/17/2005). The applicant is directed to the rejection of claims 10 and 11, as restated above.

48. **Regarding dependent claim 13**, the applicant recites: "*Kitain fails to suggest that this information is selectable*" (page 15, second paragraph of the amendment filed 3/17/2005). The applicant is directed to the rejection of claim 13, as restated above. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "*information is selectable*") are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Art Unit: 2178

49. **Regarding dependent claim 24**, the applicant recites: "*Kitain fails to suggest that the member may input or select information to include on their home page*" (page 15, third paragraph of the amendment filed 3/17/2005). The applicant is directed to the rejection of claim 24, as restated above. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "*member may ... select information*") are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

***Conclusion***

50. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

51. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gregory J. Vaughn whose telephone number is (571) 272-4131. The examiner can normally be reached Monday to Friday from 8:00 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen S. Hong can be reached at (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 272-2100.

Art Unit: 2178

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Gregory J. Vaughn  
May 20, 2005



**STEPHEN HONG**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**